

Remarks

In his office action, Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verbinski (U.S. Patent No. 6,552,346) and claims 5, 6 and 12-50 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verbinski (U.S. Patent No. 6,552,346) in view of the "Rapiscan Level 3" document cited by Applicant. Applicant has cancelled claims 1-12, 14, 27, and 37-39, amended dependent claim 21, and amended pending independent claims 13, 21, 33, 43.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's statement that "the various steps and criteria for screener certification that are claimed cannot be regarded as novel since they would have been prescribed by certification agencies and would therefore have been obvious". The present invention is directed toward novel methods and systems for effectuating uniform certification of operators. Prior to the present invention, the industry lacked a system and method that could enable a structured, uniform process for certifying operators. Through its inventions, Applicant is providing the industry with solutions to that problem. The mere fact a public or private certification agency adopts Applicants' methods and systems does not, by itself, render Applicant's inventions obvious or anticipated.

Examiner cannot summarily dismiss a point of novelty without some demonstration that certification agencies had actually generated prior art requiring the novel certification approaches invented by Applicant. Currently, Examiner's cited references fail to disclose any of the certification elements incorporated into independent claims 13, 21, 33, and 43.

Applicant believes that it has satisfactorily addressed the bases underlying the Examiner's objections and rejections and therefore submits that the present application is in form for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Hazim Ansari  
40,896